

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-13 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 10 and 11 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-13 have been amended herein merely to improve their form. The changes have not been made for any reasons related to patentability

In response to the drawing objections set forth in the above-identified Office Action, Figure 9 has been labelled “PRIOR ART” as requested by the Examiner, and reference numeral 17 and its lead line have been deleted from Figure 1. The specification has also been amended at page 8, lines 16 and 21, to correct reference numeral “40” to read --11--.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objections are requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Japanese Laid-Open Patent Application No. 11-187212 (Yoshikawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,435 (Maitani et al.). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Maitani et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,528,788

(Yamamoto et al.). Claims 5, 9, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Maitani et al. and Yamamoto et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yoshikawa is directed to a recording apparatus in which a line scanner unit 19 and a white reference unit 20 are movable between a reading position (solid lines in Figure 5) and a non-interfering position (dashed lines in Figure 5). There is no disclosure or suggestion, however, of moving the reading unit or the white reference unit during a prescanning process.

Accordingly, Yoshikawa fails to disclose or suggest at least moving a reading unit and a reference white board to a document reading position when the reading unit executes document reading, and moving the reading unit and the reference white board to a retreat position in which the influence of ambient light is reduced at least upon execution of prescanning, as is recited in independent Claims 1 and 6. Nor does Yoshikawa disclose or suggest at least moving a reading unit and a reference white board to a document reading position when the reading unit executes document reading, and moving the reading unit and the reference white board in a direction deviated from a color material discharging direction at least when the printing unit executes printing, as is recited in independent Claims 10 and 11. In Yoshikawa it appears that

the scanner unit and the white reference unit move generally parallel to the ink discharge direction.

Thus, Yoshikawa fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims

Maitani et al. is directed to an image reader in which a light source 3a for reading documents is movable to different positions to irradiate light to white board A and white boards B, C, which are each located in different positions. Maitani et al. does not disclose moving any of the white boards. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Maitani et al. with those of Yoshikawa, because the white boards in Maitani et al. are not movable. Moreover, even if combined, the resulting combination would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to move a reading unit and a reference white board to a retreat position in which the influence of ambient light is reduced at least upon execution of prescanning, as is recited in independent Claims 1 and 6. In Maitani et al., light source 3a is positioned adjacent to white board A during prescanning. Nor would the combination of Yoshikawa and Maitani et al. result in moving the reading unit and the reference white board in a direction deviated from the color material discharging direction.

Thus, Maitani et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Yoshikawa noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Yamamoto et al. has also been reviewed, but is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, Claims 1, 6, 10 and 11 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 6, 10, and 11. Dependent Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 12 and 13 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

---

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW:jab/tyr

FCHS\_WS 2750741v1